



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

(III) These two parts serve only as preliminaries to the last, the polemical part. This third division, on "Logistic and the Numeric Infinite," is both expository and critical. As exposition, it aims to provide the reader with a digest of Modern Logic which shall be at once brief and accurate. It is brief, but not accurate. The initiated will find no difficulty in detecting in M. Reymond's statements actual errors. On page 143, for example, we are told that the logical sum of two classes is equal to their logical product ("c'est à dire que $a + b = ab$ "). Such elementary mistakes render this epitome of Modern Logic an untrustworthy guide for the layman.

The polemic portion is an attempt to answer the question wherein Russell and others are wrong in considering pure mathematics as a branch of Modern Logic. This question M. Reymond hopes to answer by setting up a distinction between *numeric* and *non-numeric* classes. "Can the relation of element to class" (he asks on page 148) "in the case of numeric entities be defined in the same way as the relation of element to class in the case of non-numeric entities?" No! answers M. Reymond. And after a long discussion about the meaning of Definition in Modern Logic, and about the possibility of a logistic definition of the class "Whole number," he concludes that while such a definition of the class "*Cardinal* whole number" is possible, it is, as a definition of "Whole number," inadequate; and while a logistic definition of "*Ordinal* whole number" would be adequate, it is, from the very nature of numeric classes, impossible.

To similar results M. Reymond is led by a consideration of transfinite. For, he argues, just as the "law of generation" of elements in a simply infinite numeric class, — *e. g.*, the class "Whole number," — involves "conditions of mathematical existence" foreign to Logic, and undefinable by means of logical constants, so the "laws of generation" of elements in transfinite classes, — whatever those laws may turn out to be, — involve "extra-logical" conditions of existence which are undefinable in logical terms.

In short, according to M. Reymond, neither the concept of "Whole number" nor that of "Infinite number" is amenable to logical treatment. We must not forget, however, that the cogency of his arguments depends entirely on his distinction between numeric and non-numeric classes as logically irreducible types. Of the validity of this distinction we may be at least doubtful.

HENRY M. SHEFFER.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

Psychotherapy. By HUGO MÜNSTERBERG. New York, Moffat, Yard and Co., 1909. — pp. xi, 401.

This book is one which may be read with interest and profit, not only by physicians and psychologists but by all those who are interested in the subject without possessing any special familiarity with its problems. Dr. Münsterberg brings the results of long experience and much study to the

discussion of Psychotherapy, and his views as expressed in the work before us deserve and will repay attention, even although it cannot be claimed that the final word is here spoken upon many of the vexed questions in dispute. In the preface the author announces his two-fold aim: "to counteract the misunderstandings that over-flood the whole field, especially by the careless mixing up of mental and moral influence;" and, "to strengthen the public feeling that the time has come when every physician should systematically study psychology, the normal in the college years and the abnormal in the medical school." That the latter of these purposes has been successfully achieved it is impossible to doubt, and the chapters on "Psychology and Medicine" and "Psychotherapy and the Physician" are among the most valuable in the book. There is also much sound reasoning and vigorous common-sense in Dr. Münsterberg's arguments against the intrusions of those who are not trained physicians, — clergymen, "Faith Healers" and others, — into the province of therapy; but he does not, in the present writer's opinion, give sufficient prominence to the fact, that it has been to a great extent *because* of insufficient psychological, and it may be added ethical, insight on the part of medical men that so many of the public have permitted and encouraged the invasion of non-professional 'healers.' Surely the too ready credence given to the so-called 'mental scientist,' and the too great dependence on the clerical adviser in matters of health come in great measure not merely from the lack in the average physician of the information to be gained in the psychological laboratory but from a certain defective sympathy in him and an imperfect comprehension of the underlying facts of feeling and character, — a defect more often noticeable in the scientifically trained medical specialist of the present day than was the case with the old-fashioned 'family doctor' of a past generation. Dr. Münsterberg, however, limits the term 'psychology' to physiological psychology, and regards the knowledge of conscious life as non-scientific unless it can be translated into terms of physiological process. Thus it is, he asserts, incorrect to speak of Shakespeare's remarkable psychological insight, although he understood human beings better than others. This view is closely connected with the author's dualistic philosophy which in the work before us is asserted rather dogmatically, as though its acceptance were a matter of course, — in which the 'real' or purposive life of man is regarded as wholly separate from the psychophysical processes with which alone science has to do. To those to whom this philosophy appears to be quite untenable much of Dr. Münsterberg's argument will be unconvincing. The chapter on the Subconscious also seems unsatisfactory not so much because it begins and ends with the rather bald assertion that no such thing exists, but because there is no attempt to treat adequately of those phenomena which have led to the assumption of subconscious mental states. Even, however, if we recognize some short-comings in this treatise it is none the less certainly a valuable contribution to the discussion of a deeply interesting and important subject.

E. RITCHIE.